

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

REMARKS

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Claim 8 has been amended to further define what is claimed. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

1. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 8, 12 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boebert et al. ("Boebert," U.S. 5,864,683). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 8 has been amended to further define what is claimed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a translator for use with a first wireless network and a second wireless network and recites, among other limitations:

...the first wireless network including first terminals communicating in a first encrypted format and the second wireless network including second terminals communicating in a second encrypted format or in a non-encrypted format, the translator including a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals of the first wireless network in the first encrypted format, the translator including a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals of the second wireless network in the second encrypted format or in the non-encrypted format, ...

Amended independent claim 8 is directed to a method of communicating in a communication network including a first and a second secure wireless network, and recites, among other limitations:

communicating data among the first terminals in a first format;

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

communicating data among the second terminals in a second format;

translating selected data in the first format to translated data in the second format using a translator having a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals in the first format and a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals in the second format, . . .

Independent claim 15 is directed to a communication system and recites, among other limitations:

a first means for communicating radio signals in a first encrypted format;

a second means for communicating radio signal in a second encrypted format or in a non-encrypted format; and

a translator means including a first translator terminal for communicating with the first means in the first encrypted format and a second translator terminal for communicating with the second means in the second encrypted format or a non-encrypted format, . . .

As discussed in the Specification, in an exemplary embodiment, a translator is provided that allows communication between a first wireless network having first terminals communicating in a first format (e.g., a first encrypted format) and a second wireless network having second terminals communicating in a second format (e.g., a second encrypted format or a non-encrypted format). See, Figures 1 and 2, specification, page 8, lines 12-17. The translator may, for example, translate information from one or more of the first terminals and provide the translated information in the second format of the second wireless network for use by the second terminals. See, Figures 1 and 2, specification, page 8, lines 12-17. Accordingly, a translator 80 includes first terminals 82 with encryption capabilities in the first format and second terminals 84 with encryption capabilities in a second format or no encryption capabilities. See, Figure 2, page 9, lines 23-25. The translator may be used to integrate two or more wireless networks that utilize different encryption formats. See, Abstract, specification, page 10, lines 17-19.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

In contrast, Boebert does not teach or suggest a translator for use with a first wireless network having first terminals communicating in a first encrypted format and a second wireless network having second terminals communicating in a second encrypted format or non-encrypted format, where the translator includes a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals of the first wireless network in the first encrypted format and a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals of the second wireless network in the second encrypted format or in the non-encrypted format. Rather, Boebert discloses an apparatus and method for providing secure access to a wide-area network where a secure computer 48 is inserted in a private network 64 to serve as a gateway to the wide area or unsecured network. See, Boebert, Figures 3 and 12, col. 1, lines 11-13, col. 5, lines 46-47 and lines 58-60 and col. 6, lines 29-31. A secure wide-area access system 40 includes a workstation 63 connected to a secure computer 48 over a private network 64. See, Boebert, Figures 3 and 12, col. 7, line 66 to col. 8, line 1. The workstation 63 of the private network 64 may communicate through secure computer 48 to computers connected to a wide area network 43 or public network 74 (e.g., the Internet). See, Figures 2 and 3, col. 8, lines 2-5 and lines 55-56. Private network 64 may be wired or wireless to allow the workstation 63 to transfer data between the workstation 63 and the secure computer 48. See, Boebert, col. 8, lines 5-8.

The sections of Boebert cited by the Examiner in the Office Action teach that secure computer 48 includes program code that allows for the "transformation of data from one format to another when crossing the boundary between the private network 64 and public network 74." See, Boebert, Figure 3, col. 13, lines 1-5. In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to cite the embodiment shown in Figure 12 of Boebert as teaching a first wireless network having first terminals communicating in a first format, a second wireless network having second terminals communicating in a second format, and a translator having a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals in the first format and a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals in the second format. However, Boebert teaches that the embodiment of Figure 12 shows two wide area access systems 40 (which each include a private network 64 and workstations 63) at two different sites that belong to the same organization. See, Boebert, col. 29, lines 11-13. Each system 40 has a

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

secure computer 48 and the two systems 40 are connected by an external public network 74. See, Figure 12, Boebert, col. 29, lines 13-14. There is no teaching, however, with regard to the embodiment of Figure 12, that the two systems 40 communicate according to different formats (i.e., one of the systems 40 communicates in a first format and the other system 40 communicates in a second format.) or that a secure computer 48 would translate data from the format of one private network to the format of the other private network. Rather, Boebert teaches that a public network protocol and cryptography module of a secure computer 48 is used to select the appropriate authentication and protection mechanism for interaction on the public network 74. See, Boebert, col. 28, lines 54-57. Accordingly, claims 1, 8 and 15 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1 and is therefore allowable over Boebert for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1. Claim 12 depends from amended claim 8 and incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 8 and is therefore allowable over Boebert for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 8.

Accordingly, claims 1-2, 8, 12 and-15 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of claims 1-2, 8, 12 and 15 is respectfully requested.

2. Claim Rejections – 35. U.S.C. § 103(a)

a. Claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20

Claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 13-14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Boebert for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1. Claim 7 further recites:

... a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in the third encrypted format. . .

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

Boebert, however, does not teach or suggest a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with third terminals in the third encrypted format as indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner did not cite any reference or teaching for a translator with a third translator terminal as recited in claim 7. At pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states:

... Boebert does not specifically disclose translator communicating with third network in a third encrypted format. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Boebert to include a translator communicating with third network in a third encrypted format. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use translator in order to translate data in a different encrypted format. Each network can use different encrypted according to its security policies therefore it is desirable to use a translator that can translate data transmitted from different network. Thus allowing data to be processed efficiently.

The Examiner does not provide any teaching or suggestion for a translator including a "third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third encrypted format." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a reference showing a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third encrypted format under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, claim 7 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 9, 11 and 13-14 depend from amended claim 8 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 8 and are therefore allowable over Boebert for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 8.

In addition, claim 11 further recites the translator has a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in the third format. As discussed above with respect to claim 7, Boebert does not teach or suggest a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with third terminals in the third encrypted format.

In the Office Action, however, the Examiner does not provide any teaching or suggestion for a translator including a "third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third format." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

reference showing a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third format under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, claim 11 is believed to be allowable.

In addition, claim 14 further recites:

... wherein the first terminals are under control of a first entity,
and the second terminals are under control of a second entity,
and the translating step is under control of the first entity.

Boebert, however, does not teach or suggest the first terminals and the translating step under the control of a first entity and the second terminal is under the control of a second entity. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15, the embodiment of Boebert in Figure 12 cited by the Examiner shows two systems 40 at two different sites that belong to the same organization. See, Boebert, col. 29, lines 11-13. In the Office Action, the Examiner did not cite any reference or teaching for the first terminals and the translating step under the control of a first entity and the second terminal is under the control of a second entity. At page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner state with regard to claims 13 and 14:

In claims 13, 14: examiner takes Official notice that translating step is performed to be a translator under control of a US organization is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have translator under control of a US organization in order to prevent misuse, abuse by outsiders where security can be breached. For example, there are many circumstances where the distribution or the use of encryption is regulated by the government. Presently, US government allows general purpose encryption products to be exported from the US to other countries only if those products utilize approved encryption algorithms and key sizes are weaker than a certain measure.

The Examiner, however, does not provide any teaching or suggestion for the limitation "the first terminals are under control of a first entity, and the second terminals are under control of a second entity, and the translating step is under control of the first entity." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a reference showing the limitations of claim 14 under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, claim 14 is believed to be allowable.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 15 and are therefore allowable over Boebert for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 15.

In addition, claim 17 further recites the translator means includes a third translator terminal for communicating with the third means in the third format. As discussed above with respect to claims 7 and 11, Boebert does not teach or suggest a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with third terminals in the third encrypted format. In the Office Action, however, the Examiner does not provide any teaching or suggestion for a "third translator terminal for communicating with the third means in a third format." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a reference showing a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third format under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, claim 17 is believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 13-14 and 16-20 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-2, 8, 12 and 15 is respectfully requested.

b. Claims 3 and 4

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of Frink (U.S. 4,870,571). Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Boebert in view of Frink for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1.

c. Claims 6 and 10

Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of Ahmadi et al. ("Ahmadi," U.S. 6,597,671). Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1 and is therefore allowable over Boebert in view of Ahmadi for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1. Claim 10 depends from amended claim 8 and incorporates all of the

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

limitations of amended claim 8 and is therefore allowable over Boebert in view of Ahmadi for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 8.

3. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date *Ni* July 1, 2004

By *Nathan O Jensen*

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.
Intellectual Property Department
M/S 124-323
400 Collins Road, NE
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-1184
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No.: 26383

Nathan O. Jensen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,460